



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

[Handwritten signature]

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,159	11/14/2001	Terry Rayburn	1679	3873

7590

06/04/2004

Steven J. Funk
Sprint Corporation
8140 Ward Parkway
Kansas City, MO 64114

EXAMINER

ZEWDU, MELESS NMN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004

[Handwritten number 3]

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/991,159

Applicant(s)

RAYBURN, TERRY

Examiner

Meless N Zewdu

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is the first on the merit of the instant application.
2. Claims 1-26 are pending in this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 8, 16, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In this regard each of the cited claims recites "a call" and "threshold number of calls" followed by "the call". It is unclear to which call "the call" refers to. One can assume it could be any one of the calls among all the calls recited above. The claims can be improved by changing "a call" to -- a first call --, and "the call" to -- the first call --. Appropriate action is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeBlanc (US 5,596,625) in view of Boltz et al. (Boltz) (US 6,233,445 B1).

As per claim 1: a method of managing call traffic comprising:

receiving a request to connect a call from an originating station to a destination reads on '625 (see col. 2, lines 1-25; col. 4, lines 4-27).

routing the call to a service platform for alternative treatment reads on '625 (see fig. 3; elements 58 and 54; col. 2, lines 7-13; col. 5, line 57-col. 6, line 24). The E9-1-1 selective router routes an emergency call received by the central office (element 52) to one of the pluralities of elements 54. But, LeBlanc does not explicitly teach about making a determination that at least a threshold number of calls to the destination have originated from an area where the originating station is located, as claimed by applicant.

However, in a related field of endeavor, Boltz teaches that a threshold value, specifying a number of call connections or attempts, may/can be taken into account in treating emergency calls (see col. 1, line 49-col. 2, line 6; col. 6, lines 25-35). Note: when the references are combined as shown above, the busy channel condition described in LeBlanc would obviously include, or enhanced by, the called number threshold provided in Boltz and the emergency call routing would be in response to or based on the busy channel condition that includes the threshold value of the number of calls made or attempted. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of LeBlanc with that of Boltz's for the advantage of reducing or limiting the number of emergency calls placed and answered relating to same emergency or incident by generating an announcement that the emergency has been recognized (see col. 1, line 49-col. 2, line 6).

Art Unit: 2683

As per claim 2: the method wherein the originating station comprises a mobile station reads on '625 (see fig. 3, elements 60 and 62; col. 5, lines 24-43).

As per claim 3: the method wherein the destination comprises an emergency services network reads on '625 (see fig. 3, elements 58 and 54; col. 5, line 24-col. 6, line 24).

As per claim 4: the method further comprising:

 sending an announcement from the service platform to the originating station, advising that calls have been received from the area reads on '445 (see col. 1, line 49-col. 2, line 6).

As per claim 5: the method further comprising:

 Sending from service platform to the originating station a query asking whether the call should still be connected to the destination reads on '445 (see abstract). The prior art shows that an emergency platform provides an emergency call requester the option of being disconnected or being connected to the emergency service platform. Although what is shown is relating to a redundant/secondary emergency call, the technique obviously can apply to the original/non-redundant station/call if it was desirable to do so.

As per claim 6: the method wherein the call from the originating station to the service platform is a first call, and wherein connecting the call to the destination comprises:

 placing a second call from the service platform to the destination reads on '625 (see fig. 3, elements 60, 62, 64, 52, 58 and 54). The call between the originating station

Art Unit: 2683

(60) and the central office (52) is a first call; and the call between the central office and elements (PSAP or 54) is a second call and both are connected by the router 58.

bridging the first call with the second call reads on '625 (see fig.3, element 58).

The call path between the originating station (60) and the central office (52) is a first call; and the call path between the central office and elements (PSAP or 54) is a second call and both are bridged by the router 58.

As per claim 7: the method wherein connecting the call to the destination comprises:

releasing the call from the service platform reads on '625 (see col. 5, lines 60-65; col. 6, lines 12-24). Call forwarding can include releasing the forwarded call.

reconnecting the call to the destination reads on '625 (see col. 6, lines 12-24).

The selective router 9element 58 of fig. 3) receives the emergency call from the central office and forwards/reconnects it to a selected PSAP, (element 54) which is the final destination for the emergency call.

As per claim 8: a communication system comprising:

trigger logic executable by a processor to detect a request to connect a call from an originating terminal to a primary destination, the originating terminal being at a location reads on reads on '625 (see col. 2, lines 1,25; col. 4, lines 4-27; col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 43). The prior art shows that an emergency call is received/detected and the processor to detect cause detection of the call is obvious.

redirection logic executable by a processor to re-direct the call to a secondary destination reads on '625 (see fig. 3; elements 58 and 54; col. 2, lines 7-13; col. 5, line 57-col. 6, line 24). The E9-1-1 selective router, which obviously includes a

processor/processors, routes an emergency call received by the central office (element 52) to one of the pluralities of elements 54). But, LeBlanc does not explicitly teach about making a determination that at least a threshold number of calls to the destination have originated from an area where the originating station is located, as claimed by applicant.

However, in a related field of endeavor, Boltz teaches that a threshold value, specifying a number of call connections or attempts, may/can be taken into account in treating emergency calls (see col. 1, line 49-col. 2, line 6; col. 6, lines 25-35). Note: when the references are combined as shown above, the busy channel condition described in LeBlanc would obviously include, or enhanced by, the called number threshold provided in Boltz and the emergency call routing would be in response to or based on the busy channel condition that includes the threshold value of the number of calls made or attempted. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of LeBlanc with that of Boltz's for the advantage of reducing or limiting the number of emergency calls placed and answered relating to same emergency or incident by generating an announcement that the emergency has been recognized (see col. 1, line 49-col. 2, line 6).

As per claim 9: the communication system wherein the trigger-logic provides a signal in response to detection of the request, the system further comprising:

location-logic executable by a processor, in response to the signal, to determine the location of the originating terminal reads on '625 (see col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 9). A processor is an obvious component to the prior art embodiment.

As per claim 10: the communication wherein;

the trigger-logic is executed in a switch reads on '625 (see col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 9). The prior art includes/shows trigger-logic executing switch/es.

As per claim 11: the communication wherein the call-density logic and re-direction logic are both executed in a service control point reads on '625 (see fig. 3, element 42; col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 43).

As per claim 12: the features of claim 12 are similar to the features of claim 1. Hence claim 12 is rejected on the same ground and motivation as claim 1.

As per claim 13: the feature of claim 13 is similar to the feature of claim 5. Hence, claim 13 is rejected on the same ground and motivation as claim 5.

As per claim 14: the feature of claim 14 is similar to the feature of claim 5. The prior art of record, as shown in claim 5, shows that an emergency station is provided with the option of terminating or connecting the call.

As per claim 15: the feature of claim 15 is similar to the feature of claim 6. The prior art (in fig. 3, and as discussed in the rejection of claim 5, shows the features of claims 5 and 15, which is an arbitrary partitioning of the path followed by an emergency call.

As per claim 16: the features of claim 16 are identical to the features of claim 1. Hence, claim 16 is rejected on the same ground and motivation as claim 1. There is no substantive difference between claims 1 and 16, except the preamble of claim 1 is directed managing call traffic and that of claim 16 managing emergency service calls which are call traffic.

As per claim 17: the feature of claim 17 is similar to the feature of claim 4. Hence, claim 17 is rejected on the same ground and motivation as claim 4.

As per claim 18: the method further comprising:

after notifying the user that emergency service calls have already been placed from the area, operating the service node to prompt the user for an indication that the user still wants to be connected to the emergency service center reads on '445 (see abstract). The prior art provides whether a user wants to terminate the emergency call or wants to be connected to the emergency center. Since the announcement/notification is sent to the affected area, not to a single individual, all mobile stations in that area can receive/hear it.

in response to the indication, connecting the call to the emergency service center reads on '445 (see abstract). If the user opted to be connected to the emergency center, it is obvious that the prior art communication system can fulfill that.

As per claim 19: the method wherein the indication comprises a DTMF signal established at the mobile station reads on '625 (see fig. 3, elements 60). The mobile phones depicted in fig. 3, include a keyboard with push button for generating DTMF signal.

As per claim 20: the method wherein making a determination that at least a threshold number of emergency service calls originated from an area where the mobile is located comprises:

determining a location of the mobile station reads on '625 (see abstract).

determining a number of emergency service calls that have been placed from an area encompassing the location with a past predetermined time period reads on '455(see col. 6, lines 25-35). The word 'until' is indicative of time. For example, the threshold may be monitored within the time interval that takes to handle the emergency situation is handled properly.

determining that the number exceeds a predetermined threshold reads on '445 (see col. 6, lines 25-35). The use of a threshold value includes determining if the value is surpassed. Note: claim 20 encompasses the combined references shown in claims 1 and 16. Hence, the ground and motivation are as provided therein.

As per claim 21: the method wherein the area is defined by a predefined radius distance from the location of the mobile station reads on '625 (see col. 17, lines 29-67; col. 19, lines 28-50). It is known that a base station's coverage area is represented by a hexagonal shape/configuration to approximately a circular coverage area. It is also known that a circular area includes a radius which is similar to what is provided in the prior art as distance.

As per claim 22: the method further comprising maintaining a record of originating times and originating locations of emergency service calls, wherein determining the number of emergency calls that have been placed from the area within the past predetermined time period comprises:

using the record to determine how many calls have been placed from the area within the past predetermined time period reads on '445 (see col. 1, line 49-col. 2, line 6; col. 6, lines 25-35). Threshold obviously requires originating time and originating

Art Unit: 2683

number of whatever is being monitored/considered. Furthermore, the prior art of record shows determination of emergency call originating location.

As per claim 23: the method wherein determining the location of the mobile station comprises:

applying position determining equipment reads on '625 (see col. 5, lines 10-23).

As per claim 24: the method further comprising:

applying a service control point to make the determination that at least a threshold rate of emergency service calls have originated from an area where the mobile station is located a reads on '445 (see col. 1, line 49-col. 2, line 6; col. 6, lines 25-35).

As per claim 25: a system for managing emergency service calls, the system comprising:

means for receiving a request to connect a call from a mobile station to an emergency service center reads on '625 (see figs. 2 and 3; abstract; col. 2, lines 1-25; col. 4, lines 4-27).

means for routing the call to a service platform for alternative treatment reads on '625 (see fig. 3; elements 58 and 54; col. 2, lines 7-13; col. 5, line 57-col. 6, line 24).

The E9-1-1 selective router routes an emergency call received by the central office (element 52) to one of the pluralities of elements 54. But, LeBlanc does not explicitly teach about making a determination that at least, a threshold rate of emergency service calls have originated from an area where the originating station is located, as claimed by applicant.

However, in a related field of endeavor, Boltz teaches that a threshold value, specifying a number of call connections or attempts, may/can be taken into account in treating emergency calls (see col. 1, line 49-col. 2, line 6; col. 6, lines 25-35). Note: when the references are combined as shown above, the busy channel condition described in LeBlanc would obviously include, or enhanced by, the called number threshold provided in Boltz and the emergency call routing would be in response to or based on the busy channel condition that includes the threshold value of the number of calls made or attempted. Furthermore, the rate calls is determinable from the number of calls monitored and the interval of time taken to monitor the calls. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of LeBlanc with that of Boltz's for the advantage of reducing or limiting the number of emergency calls placed and answered relating to same emergency or incident by generating an announcement that the emergency has been recognized (see col. 1, line 49-col. 2, line 6).

As per claim 26: regarding claim 26, LeBlanc discloses a system for managing emergency service calls, wherein the system comprises a wireless carrier network programmed to perform function in response to a request to connect a call from a mobile station to an emergency service center (see abstract, figs. 1 and 2; col. 2, lines 1-25; col. 4, lines 4-27).

routing the call to a service node for alternate treatment reads on '625 (see fig. 3; elements 58 and 54; col. 2, lines 7-13; col. 5, line 57-col. 6, line 24). The E9-1-1

Art Unit: 2683

selective router routes an emergency call received by the central office (element 52) to one of the pluralities of elements 54

However, LeBlanc does not explicitly teach about making determination that at least a threshold number of emergency service calls have originated from an area where the mobile station is located, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related field of endeavor, Boltz teaches that a threshold value, specifying a number of call connections or attempts, may/can be taken into account in treating emergency calls (see col. 1, line 49-col. 2, line 6; col. 6, lines 25-35). Note: when the references are combined as shown above, the busy channel condition described in LeBlanc would obviously include, or enhanced by, the called number threshold provided in Boltz and the emergency call routing would be in response to or based on the busy channel condition that includes the threshold value of the number of calls made or attempted. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of LeBlanc with that of Boltz's for the advantage of reducing or limiting the number of emergency calls placed and answered relating to same emergency or incident by generating an announcement that the emergency has been recognized (see col. 1, line 49-col. 2, line 6).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meless N Zewdu whose telephone number is (703) 306-5418. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am to 5:00 pm..

Art Unit: 2683

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on (703) 308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Meless Zewdu



Examiner

29 May 2004.



**WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**